

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 16, 20, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,697,275 of Hiyakawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,782,944, of Hiyakawa et al., or U.S. Patent No. 4,547,450 of Maeda et al. The Examiner also objected to claims 17-19 and 21 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 38 and canceled claim 17. As a result, claims 16, 18-21, and 38 remain pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of claims 16, 20, and 38 under Section 102(b) as anticipated by Hiyakawa et al. '275, Hiyakawa et al. '944, or Maeda et al. However, to advance prosecution, Applicants have amended independent claim 16 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 17 and have canceled claim 17. Applicants have also amended independent claim 38 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 17. As a result, claims 16 and 38 and claims 18-21 that depend from claim 16 should all be in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. A favorable action is requested.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 25, 2006

By: 

Richard V. Burgujian  
Reg. No. 31,744